

REMARKS

The Office Action of 11/28/2006 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.


Claims 1 and 3 were rejected as being anticipated by Tremblay. Claim 2 was rejected as being unpatentable over the same. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited reference. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, claim 1 has been amended to make clear that the recited "holdable registers" are separate from the "register file." This is made clear in Figures 2 and 3 of the specification.

Concerning Tremblay, the rejection cites Tremblay's teaching of "a multi-ported register file that is divided into a plurality of separate register file segments, each of the register file segments being associated to one of the plurality of functional units." This register file may be read as corresponding to the register file recited in the claims. As made clear in the present amendment, however, the holdable registers, located as recited in claim 1, are separate from the register file. Hence, Tremblay is not believed to teach or suggest the invention as now recited in claim 1 as amended.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Ure", is written over a horizontal line.

Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 02/28/2007